

**REMARKS**

By the above amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 1-37 and added new claims 38-70. Applicants respectfully submit that no prohibited new matter has been added by these amendments. Further, based on the following reasoning, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections presented in the Office Action of May 12, 2006 and request allowance of the present application.<sup>1</sup>

The Examiner objected to the Declaration as being allegedly defective. Applicants hereby submit a new Declaration and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

Further, in view of the cancellation of claims 1-37 by the above amendment, the outstanding rejections of claims 1-37 in the Office Action of May 12, 2006 have been rendered moot. Moreover, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the elements of new claims 38-70.

For example, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 38, including: "receiving, by a server, metadata for a course catalog from the external system; presenting the course catalog to a user of the server, wherein the course catalog describes courses hosted by the external system; receiving from the user a selection of at least one course from the courses hosted by the external

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions or requirements applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

system; and communicating with the external system to provide access to the at least one selected course to the user.” Robinson et al. is directed to creating, processing and managing educational content within and between schools. However, Robinson et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 38, including “receiving, by a server, metadata for a course catalog from the external system” and “presenting the course catalog to a user of the server, wherein the course catalog describes courses hosted by the external system” (emphasis added). Robinson et al. also fails to teach or suggest “receiving from the user a selection of at least one course from the courses hosted by the external system” and “communicating with the external system to provide access to the at least one selected course to the user,” as further recited in claim 38. Moreover, Eisendrath et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Robinson et al. Eisendrath et al. is directed to an online virtual campus. To this end, Eisendrath et al. teaches providing a course catalog that includes a list of courses offered and course descriptions of the courses. (Col. 6, lines 54-59). However, Eisendrath et al. fails to teach or suggest “presenting the course catalog to a user of the server, wherein the course catalog describes courses hosted by the external system; receiving from the user a selection of at least one course from the courses hosted by the external system; and communicating with the external system to provide access to the at least one selected course to the user,” as recited in independent claim 38 (emphasis added). Therefore, the prior art of record, either alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 38.

Further, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 68-70. For example, the references applied by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest “a back end that stores information that relates to the electronic course, wherein the stored information comprises metadata that comprises a course catalog for the electronic course, and the course catalog describes courses hosted by the external system and includes a description of material in the courses, and further wherein the back end obtains the metadata from the external system,” as recited in claim 68 (emphasis added). The prior art also does not disclose or teach all of the limitations of independent claim 69, including “a back end to maintain information on the ELS about the electronic course, wherein the stored information comprises metadata that comprises a course catalog for the electronic course and the course catalog describes courses hosted by the external system and includes a description of material in the courses, and further wherein the back end obtains the metadata from the external system,” and the limitations of independent claim 70, including “presents a course catalog to a user of the second ELS, wherein the course catalog describes courses hosted by the first ELS; receives a selection of at least one course from the courses hosted by the first ELS by the user.” Robinson et al. and Eisendrath et al., either alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these limitations.

In view of the foregoing, claims 38 and 68-70 are allowable over the prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections by the Examiner is respectfully request and believed to be appropriate.

Independent claims 48 and 58, although of different scope, recite features similar to that discussed above with regard to claim 38. Moreover, claims 39-47, 49-57, and 59-67, by virtue of their dependence from independent claims 38, 48, or 58, also require the elements of claims 38, 48, or 58. As such, Applicants submit that claims 38-70 are allowable over the prior art.


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance all of the pending claims 38-70.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 9, 2006

By:   
Milan S. Kapadia  
Reg. No. 55,982